

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Diana Hynek
Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer
Office of the Chief Information Officer
14th and Constitution Ave. NW.
Room 6625
Washington, DC 20230

05/07/2004

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken the following action on your request for approval of a new information collection received on 02/26/2004.

TITLE: Atlantic Sea Scallops Amendment 10 Data Collection

AGENCY FORM NUMBER(S): None

ACTION : APPROVED WITHOUT CHANGE

OMB NO.: 0648-0491

EXPIRATION DATE: 05/31/2007

BURDEN:	RESPONSES	HOURS	COSTS(\$,000)
Previous	0	0	0
New	3,175	358	2
Difference	3,175	358	2
Program Change		358	2
Adjustment		0	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE: None

OMB Authorizing Official	Title
Donald R. Arbuckle	Deputy Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

Please read the instructions before completing this form. For additional forms or assistance in completing this form, contact your agency's Paperwork Clearance Officer. Send two copies of this form, the collection instrument to be reviewed, the supporting statement, and any additional documentation to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503.

1. Agency/Subagency originating request	2. OMB control number b. <input type="checkbox"/> None a. _____ - _____
3. Type of information collection (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> New Collection b. <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of a currently approved collection c. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of a currently approved collection d. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired e. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired f. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing collection in use without an OMB control number For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions	4. Type of review requested (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular submission b. <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency - Approval requested by _____ / _____ / _____ c. <input type="checkbox"/> Delegated 5. Small entities Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 6. Requested expiration date a. <input type="checkbox"/> Three years from approval date b. <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____ / _____
7. Title	
8. Agency form number(s) (<i>if applicable</i>)	
9. Keywords	
10. Abstract	
11. Affected public (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Individuals or households d. <input type="checkbox"/> Farms b. <input type="checkbox"/> Business or other for-profit e. <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Government c. <input type="checkbox"/> Not-for-profit institutions f. <input type="checkbox"/> State, Local or Tribal Government	12. Obligation to respond (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary b. <input type="checkbox"/> Required to obtain or retain benefits c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory
13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden a. Number of respondents _____ b. Total annual responses _____ 1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically _____ % c. Total annual hours requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____	14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (<i>in thousands of dollars</i>) a. Total annualized capital/startup costs _____ b. Total annual costs (O&M) _____ c. Total annualized cost requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____
15. Purpose of information collection (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Application for benefits e. <input type="checkbox"/> Program planning or management b. <input type="checkbox"/> Program evaluation f. <input type="checkbox"/> Research c. <input type="checkbox"/> General purpose statistics g. <input type="checkbox"/> Regulatory or compliance d. <input type="checkbox"/> Audit	16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (<i>check all that apply</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Recordkeeping b. <input type="checkbox"/> Third party disclosure c. <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting 1. <input type="checkbox"/> On occasion 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annually 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Annually 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Biennially 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) _____
17. Statistical methods Does this information collection employ statistical methods <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission) Name: _____ Phone: _____

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

On behalf of this Federal Agency, I certify that the collection of information encompassed by this request complies with 5 CFR 1320.9

NOTE: The text of 5 CFR 1320.9, and the related provisions of 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3), appear at the end of the instructions. *The certification is to be made with reference to those regulatory provisions as set forth in the instructions.*

The following is a summary of the topics, regarding the proposed collection of information, that the certification covers:

- (a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;
- (b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;
- (c) It reduces burden on small entities;
- (d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;
- (e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;
- (f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;
- (g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):
 - (i) Why the information is being collected;
 - (ii) Use of information;
 - (iii) Burden estimate;
 - (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
 - (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
 - (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;
- (h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);
- (i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and
- (j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

If you are unable to certify compliance with any of the provisions, identify the item below and explain the reason in Item 18 of the Supporting Statement.

Signature of Senior Official or designee

Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Line Office Chief Information Officer, head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or StaffOffice)	
Signature	Date
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

NORTHEAST REGION SEA SCALLOP AMENDMENT 10 REQUIREMENTS

INTRODUCTION

This submission requests approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) clearance of the new collection related to OMB# 0648-0416 as it pertains Amendment 10 to the Sea Scallop FMP reporting requirements. The requirements include increased observer coverage, broken trip adjustment and DAS-exchange procedures, and scallop surveys and research. Prior approval of the observer coverage requirements was limited to the controlled access areas. However, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is also requesting approval to expand the observer coverage program requirements to open scallop areas as defined in Amendment 10 Section 5.1.8.1.

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary.

Amendment 10 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan (FMP) includes new information requirements corresponding to the following measures approved by the Council:

- a) Broken trip procedure
- b) One-to-one exchange controlled access trips
- c) Open area DAS set-aside for the extension of the observer program to include open scallop areas.
- d) Cooperative surveys

a) The broken trip procedure allows adjustment of DAS for the controlled access area trips terminated prematurely due to an emergency, poor weather, or any other reason deemed appropriate by the captain as described in Section 5.1.2.4 of Amendment 10. The intent of this action is to reduce fishing costs and the losses from broken trips, and to provide more incentive for vessels to take their controlled access trips. This provision will allow a vessel to fish at 1,500 lb. per day for the remaining days of a broken trip. The vessels are required to provide a notice of trip termination via VMS in order to apply for broken trip adjustment with the following information: Vessel name and permit number, owner and operator's name, owner and operator's phone numbers, the reason for the termination of the trip. Vessels may use the VMS e-mail messaging system or a personal computer equipped with e-mail messaging. The vessels will also need to submit an application form for DAS/trip adjustment with the following information: Vessel name and permit number, owner and operator's name, owner and operator's phone numbers, actual DAS use and scallop landings. The costs of filling these applications are estimated to be minimal, and be outweighed by the benefits from the broken trip adjustment.

b) The intent of the provision for “one-to-one exchange controlled access trips” is to provide flexibility to the vessels about where to fish. Under Amendment 10 regulations, DAS allocations will be area-specific in order to achieve optimum yield from individual areas with differing scallop abundance and growth potential, and thus to maximize the yield from the overall scallop resource. Although this action is expected to benefit most vessels in the scallop fishery by increasing the productivity of the scallop resource, the benefits may not necessarily be equally distributed. Some vessels could incur losses from area-specific trip and DAS allocations if they are unable to take their trips to specific controlled access areas due to the limitations in vessel size and equipment, safety concerns, or cost factors. To mitigate these adverse impacts, Amendment 10 includes a provision that allows for one-to-one exchange of controlled access area DAS allocations. The participants will need to send an application form to NMFS through mail notifying NMFS of such exchange with the following information: Vessel name and permit number, owner and operator's name, owner and operator's phone numbers, specification of the area of which the owner intends to exchange his/her DAS, the area for which the DAS allocation is exchanged for, owner and operator's name of the vessel that the exchange is conducted with, and their phone numbers. Both vessels involved in the exchange would be required to submit forms for cross verification. This measure is expected to provide flexibility to vessels regarding which areas to fish, thereby reducing the possibility of revenue loss to those vessels that are unable to access some distant areas due to their capacity constraints. Although, there will be some transaction costs associated with the exchange of the controlled area trips with another vessel, such as notifying NMFS of such exchange, the net impacts of exchange should result in a reduction in overall costs of fishing if a vessel is engaged in such a transaction. Administrative and enforcement costs associated with the exchange of controlled access trip authorizations should be relatively modest when compared with the potential improvement in controlled access allocation programs and reduced economic costs to the industry.

c) Vessels with sea scallop fishing permits may be required by the Regional Administrator to carry onboard an observer, whose costs will be borne by the vessel. Unlike the existing controlled access set aside, Amendment 10 expands this program to the entire fishery, applied to both controlled access areas and regular open scallop fishing areas (Section 5.1.8.1 of Amendment 10). More observer coverage is needed to improve the estimated amount of finfish bycatch in order to comply with National Standard 9, and to determine the level of sea turtle takes in the scallop fishery. Amendment 10 establishes a one percent DAS set aside to provide partial funding for this program, and to allow compensation to vessel owners and crews, which will pay for observers. The Regional Administrator will adjust the DAS charge for an observed trip or increase the vessel's annual DAS allocation by applying a constant adjustment factor that applies to each DAS on an observed trip, taking into account the average open area catch per day expected from open fishing areas and the effect that the amount has on sampling frequency. To facilitate the random observer selection process a vessel must provide NMFS with notice at least five working days prior to the date it intends to depart into a specific area via VMS e-mail messaging system or a personal computer equipped with e-

mail messaging. The following information should be included in the notice: Vessel name and permit number, owner and operator's name, owner and operator's phone numbers, and number of trips anticipated for the month in question. For further discussion and analysis on this program see Section 8.2.4 of Amendment 10.

d) NMFS will also initiate a cooperative industry survey to provide information for rotation area management (Section 5.1.8.2 of Amendment 10). These surveys will increase the sampling intensity and assist in estimating the distribution and biomass of scallops in specific areas. Vessel compensation and direct administrative costs of this survey will be recaptured from a two percent set-aside to fund research and resource monitoring. The vessel owners will need to submit an application form to enroll in this program which supply information on vessel name and permit number, owner and operator's name, owner and operator's phone numbers, vessel specifications, including size, horsepower, and number of berths, on vessel and captain availability, vessel owner/captain experience, and estimated cost per DAS for vessel use. Although this requirement will increase the burden on respondents, the funds obtained through set-asides will reduce the compliance costs for vessels by providing compensation for observer coverage. The scallop industry will benefit from improved management made possible through cooperative industry surveys and research funded by TAC/DAS set-asides. In addition to the cooperative industry surveys, there will be a scallop research program, which will continue using the existing administrative procedures with an increase in funding to a two-percent TAC/DAS set aside (Section 5.1.8.3 of Amendment 10). The research projects under these set-aside programs are entirely covered under PRA already cleared for grants applications; thus, they do not need any additional collection.

2. Explain how, by whom, how frequently, and for what purpose the information will be used. If the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support information that will be disseminated to the public, then explain how the collection complies with all applicable Information Quality Guidelines.

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. Several offices of NMFS, the U.S. Coast Guard and the Fishery Management Councils will utilize the information. Data collected through these programs will be incorporated into the NMFS database. Aggregated summaries of the collected information will be used to evaluate the management program and future management proposals. As explained in the preceding paragraphs, and in item #1 in particular, the information gathered has utility. NOAA Fisheries will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response #10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to Section 515 of Public Law 106-554.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology.

This proposal uses improved, existing technology to reduce reporting burdens. The VMS unit is used to monitor fishing locations in the Atlantic Sea scallop fishery. This electronic system broadcasts the vessel's position on a random, periodic basis. The addition of onboard observers and use of VMS messaging to report real-time scallop catch and yellowtail flounder by-catch are significant management information and enforcement tools. This technology also helps verify fishing locations and monitoring of effort controls in other area closures. This will result, in concert with the mandatory observer program, in a more accurate monitoring of the area TACs, benefiting the scallop industry from improved management. It will also facilitate monitoring of the fishery by enforcement agents. In fact, if these technologies were not available or were not used, it is extremely unlikely that the New England Fishery Management Council would have approved the area rotation management for scallops.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

The duplication of effort to collect landings and by-catch data is necessary to assure that the TAC for scallops, and the trigger for closing the exempted fishery based on yellowtail by-catch, is not exceeded. The duplication of effort is described in item 7.

5. If the collection of information involves small businesses or other small entities, describe the methods used to minimize burden.

Most of the respondents qualify as small businesses. Only the minimum data needed to monitor compliance with regulations are requested from all respondents. i.e., observers are reporting scallop catch and yellowtail by-catch once per day, a termination notice for broken trips and enrollment for cooperative surveys via VMS. VMS is already required for all full-time and part-time scallop vessels fishing in the groundfish controlled access areas. Occasional vessels may optionally participate in a call-in system. Since most of the respondents are small businesses, separate requirements based on the size of business have not been developed.

6. Describe the consequences to the Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently.

Daily messages are necessary to assure that finfish by-catch limits are not exceeded, particularly with hundreds of vessels operating at the same time. Transmissions for each 30 minutes are required to accurately determine the fishing locations, thus to enforce compliance with controlled access rules. Therefore, if the collection is not conducted

and is conducted less frequently, it may not be possible to accurately determine the fishing locations, assure compliance with the finfish by-catch limits and controlled access rules.

7. Explain any special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

The data collection is consistent with OMB guidelines, except that the VMS will be required to report vessel catch and by-catch on daily basis when the vessel is underway in closed areas. As described above, daily reports are required to accurately determine scallop catch and yellowtail flounder by-catch, particularly in a fishery managed with area specific TACs. This is the only way that actual catch and landings can be verified on a near real-time basis. Although Fishing Vessel Trip Reports (FVTR) are required within 30 days and includes gross fishing areas, the auditing process lengthens the time for the information to reach management offices to about 3 months. In addition, absent a VMS, there is no way to verify the catch locations as reported on the form.

In order to enforce restrictions on scallop vessels accessing the closed areas, VMS position reports are necessary. Full and part-time scallop vessels are currently polled once every 30 minutes.

As a way to determine the pool of vessels on which to place observers, each vessel operator will be required to inform NMFS of its intention to fish in open or controlled access area through the VMS e-mail system five working days notice prior to any trip.

8. Provide a copy of the PRA Federal Register notice that solicited public comments on the information collection prior to this submission. Summarize the public comments received in response to that notice and describe the actions taken by the agency in response to those comments. Describe the efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

The specific requirements of Amendment 10 were developed over the course of about three years and received extensive public discussion in Council, committee and industry advisory meetings. Specifically, the Council held 60 policy-meeting days, 47 scientific and technical meeting-days during the development of Amendment 10. The Council also held 11 public hearing meetings, 4 Scoping meetings during 2000-2002, and 7 public hearing meetings on DSEIS in May 2003, at which there were public discussion of the monitoring requirements (see Table 146 in Section 8.1.1 of Amendment 10 for further information). Interested parties were provided the opportunity to submit written comments at the public hearings and during the 90-day comment period following the submission of the Draft Amendment document in April 2003. The Council selected the

final alternatives in August and September 2003 based on public comment and scientific advice.

A proposed rule being published in conjunction with this submission will solicit public comment on these requirements.

9. Explain any decisions to provide payments or gifts to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

No payment or gift will be made to respondents. Observers will be paid from the proceeds of an additional DAS/pounds allocation. Under the system that applies for controlled access areas, a vessel carrying an observer will be allowed to land more than the 18,000 lb. scallop possession limit on an observed trip. For open fishing areas, a vessel carrying a mandatory observer would be granted a DAS adjustment or rebate, using a constant factor per observer day. The Regional Administrator may reduce the number of DAS charged for an observed trip, or may increase the vessel's annual DAS allocation to allow the vessel to fish more DAS in the year than it would have without carrying observers.

10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy.

All data will be kept confidential as required by Section 402(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, will be maintained in accordance with NOAA Administrative Order 216-100, Confidentiality of Fisheries Statistics, and will not be released for public use except in aggregate statistical form (and without identifying the source of data, i.e. vessel name, owner, etc.)

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private.

There are no questions of a sensitive nature.

12. Provide an estimate in hours of the burden of the collection of information.

Amendment 10 considers two scenarios concerning scallop fishing on Georges Bank. One scenario considers the impacts (including reporting burden and cost) of scallop vessels being allowed to fish within the Georges Bank groundfish closed areas. However, this scenario is contingent upon subsequent action under both the Multispecies FMP and the Scallop FMP. Nevertheless, this document considers this scenario so that long term impacts and associated reporting costs and burdens could be considered. The

second scenario considers the reporting and burden requirements without access to the Georges Bank groundfish closed areas. This scenario would most likely be implemented for the initial period under Amendment 10 but may be replaced shortly with an access program for scallop vessels in the Georges Bank groundfish closed areas. To ensure that the highest burden in hours and the cost to the public are accounted for, this submission considers the scenario with the higher value.

Table 7 summarizes the burden hours, number of respondents, and total burden of the application for broken trip adjustment and for one-to-one DAS exchange, and enrollment requirements in the observer program and cooperative industry surveys. The numbers reflect estimates for the new requirements only. The burden hours are based on the number of participants expected to be active in the limited access scallop fishery. The exact number of current participants is the number of limited access, scallop permit holders as of 2003 fishing year as shown in Table 1. The characteristics and the principal port of these vessels are shown in Table 2.

a) Broken trip adjustment

The vessels will need to submit a trip termination notice via VMS, and an application for DAS/trip adjustment with actual DAS use and landings in order to obtain adjustment for their broken trips.

The vessels returning from a controlled access area trip will be charged two days-at-sea plus one day-at-sea for each 10% of the scallop possession limit on board the vessel. The vessel will be allowed to fish the rest of its DAS allocation in that area minus this DAS charge for the broken trip. In order to estimate the number of broken trips, it is assumed that there will be an incentive for vessels to apply for a broken trip adjustment for any trip with landings less than 12,000 pounds, because at anything less than this amount they will only get at the maximum 2 days to fish. The controlled access trips potentially with landings less than 12,000 pounds were estimated using the data for years 2001 to 2003. Because of the lack of accuracy in identifying the controlled access trips by areas and poundage, the numerical results are just approximations of the potential number of trips with landings less than 12,000 pounds.

Method of estimation: The number of potential broken trips is estimated as follows:

- Table 3 shows the number of controlled access trips in Hudson Canyon and Virginia Beach areas by fishing year according to the DAS-VMS and Catch-VMS databases.¹ Unfortunately, the numbers obtained from these two databases do not match and Catch-VMS data may not be reliable in its present condition because it seems to underestimate the number of controlled access trips especially for the

¹ DAS-VMS database includes the number of trips only, whereas, Catch-VMS database includes the scallop pounds landed as the limited access vessels report it once a day by e-mail. It seems that, some vessels fail to report scallop pounds they caught on a daily basis, resulting in underestimation of the controlled access area trips.

2002 and 2003 fishing years. Nevertheless, the estimates are derived from Catch-VMS dataset because it is the only source with information on the number of trips and pounds landed from each trip. Additionally, the goal is to estimate percentage of the controlled access trips with landings less than 12,000 pounds based on this data, not the absolute numbers. In this regard, it was assumed all controlled access trips were underestimated equally, and regardless of poundage, so that the percentage of trips with landings less than 12,000 pounds still provides a good approximation to the actual numbers.

- The number of controlled access trips by year, area and poundage are shown in Table 3.² As Table 3 shows, the percentage of controlled access trips from all areas with landings less than 12,000 pounds declined from 31.83% in 2001, to 19.77% in 2002, and to 10.78% on 2003 fishing year. This declining trend could be due to the improvement in scallop resource resulting in higher pounds per trip over time. Since it is not known if this trend will continue in the future, the percentage of trips with landings less than 12,000 pounds is estimated as an average of the years from 2001 to 2003. This percentage equals to 27.77% of all the controlled access area trips.
- The future number of broken trips will be a function of the total number of controlled area access trips. We assumed that 27.77% of these trips will have landings less than 12,000 pounds, and constitute the potential number of applications for broken trip adjustment. Table 4 shows the initial allocations of controlled access area trips for the years 2004 to 2006 by permit category for two scenarios with and without access to the Georges Bank groundfish areas. If there is no access to these areas, the number of trips to the Hudson Canyon access area will average 677 trips per year during 2004-2006, and of these, 188 (27.77% of 677) are estimated to be broken trips. If access to Georges Bank groundfish areas is provided via Framework 16, however, the number of total number of trips allocated to the access areas, including the Georges Bank and Hudson Canyon areas will be about 1,733 trips, and the potential number of broken trips are estimated to be 481 (27.77% of 1,733). The burden time is estimated for each scenario with or without access to the Georges Bank controlled access areas. The

² Many reports in VMS database do not include access area, and are listed as “unknown.” Some of these could be Hudson Canyon trips, but may also include trips from outside the access areas, which were incorrectly submitted through VMS. These trips were not included in estimating the potential broken trips. There were also trip reports with landings apparently more than 25,000 pounds from the controlled access area. Since this amount exceeds the trip limit (21,000 lb) for these areas, which may indicate that there may be grouping of trips within a fishing year that were inaccurately entered, or the trip was not in an access area, or that there was an observer onboard for these trips so that the possession limit was increased to cover the costs of the observer. Also, these records may have just overestimated the pounds from the trips with more than 12,000 pounds, and therefore, may not present a problem in terms of accuracy in estimation percentage of potential number of broken trips. These trips constituted less than 1% of the controlled access area trips in 2001. This percentage increased to 28% in 2002, and 44% in 2003 fishing years, perhaps indicating the improvement in resource conditions and increased landings per day-at-sea in these areas. For these reasons, these imperfections in the dataset had to be ignored, and it was assumed that the percentage of trips with landings less than 12,000 pounds provided a good approximation to the actual numbers, even though the absolute numbers might not be accurate.

number of entities, i.e., limited access vessels, are assumed to be 321, and an average number of applications per entity is estimated to be 1.49 (481 divided by 321) with access and 0.58 (188/321) without access. As Table 4 shows full-time limited access vessels are expected to have more broken trips than part-time and occasional vessels because they will have more controlled access trips. On the other hand, part-time and occasional vessels tend to be smaller than the full-time counterparts, and may declare more broken trips to maximize their landings from the controlled access areas. No distinction is made for this in the total burden estimates presented in Table 7, because the total burden hours are estimated from the total number of broken trips and therefore, would remain the same regardless of the permit category of the vessel that declared a broken trip.

Burden estimates for trip termination notice: The vessels are required to provide a notice of trip termination via VMS in order to apply for broken trip adjustment. Vessels may use the VMS e-mail messaging system or a personal computer equipped with e-mail messaging. The estimated annual cost to respondents for the hour burden this collection assumes a respondent wage of \$15/hour. Hour burdens and costs are itemized in Table 7. The average estimated burden was assumed to be 2 minutes per notice, amounting to a total of 16.07 hours, and \$240.98 in reporting burden to respondents if there is access, and 6.28 hours and \$94.19 in cost of burden if there is no access to Georges Bank groundfish areas.

Burden estimates for application form: The burden of filling out the application form for DAS/trip adjustment with actual DAS use and landings is estimated to be 30 minutes per response to the public. Accordingly, a total of 240.50 hours (481 responses x 0.5 hrs/response) is estimated to be the burden for participants in this new data collection if there is access to the GBGF. The estimated annual cost to respondents for the hour burden this collection assumes a respondent wage of \$15/hour. Using this figure, the annualized cost to respondents would be approximately \$3,607.50. The burden will be 94 hours, and will cost \$1,410 if there is no access to the Georges Bank groundfish areas (Table 7).

b) One-to-one DAS exchange provision

Amendment 10 includes a provision, which allows one-to-one exchange of controlled access area DAS allocations among the limited access permit holders. This measure is expected to provide flexibility to vessels regarding which areas to fish, thereby reducing the possibility for revenue loss to those vessels that are unable to access some distant areas due to their capacity constraints. No DAS-exchange is allowed, however, for the open areas as defined in Amendment 10.

Obviously, there could be an incentive for a DAS exchange only if the vessels are allocated trips in different controlled access areas located in varying distances to their home ports. In other words, Georges Bank groundfish areas should be given access through Framework 16 so that some vessels could exchange their Mid-Atlantic area

controlled access trips with other vessels for the Georges Bank access areas, or vice versa.

Since the part-time and occasional vessels will in general get only one or two trips to the controlled access areas, they will be able to choose which access area to fish up to the maximum number of trips allocated to each vessel. Therefore, in most cases, these vessels will not need to trade their controlled access area trips with other vessels. For example, occasional vessels could be allocated one controlled access area trip per year in 2004, which they could take to any of the controlled access area open in a particular year (see Table 7 in Section 5.1.2.1 of Amendment 10). The part-time vessels could be allocated 2 trips to the controlled access areas, of which only one could be taken in Closed Area I (if opened via Framework 16) because that represents the maximum number of trips per vessel for that area. They would be allowed to take both of these trips in the Hudson Canyon or Nantucket Lightship Area, however. For these reasons, in estimating the burden hours from this provision, it is assumed that the part-time and occasional vessels will not engage in DAS exchanges.

Although the number of vessels that will apply for DAS exchange for the controlled access trips cannot be estimated with certainty, a conservative estimate could be obtained by assuming that all full-time limited access scallop vessels will conduct one exchange per year, whenever there are one controlled access area open in both the Georges Bank and Mid-Atlantic regions (i.e. 2004 and 2005; and potentially 2007 - 2009 when the Elephant Trunk area re-opens). The number of full-time permits was 270 in 2002 and 278 in 2003. The burden hours are estimated using the recent data for 2003 and assuming that all these permits-holders, that is 278 vessels, will participate in the scallop fishery in the future years. Since each vessel involved in the exchange of trips would be required to submit the form, the total number of respondents is considered to be 556.

This new data collection is similar in nature to another data collection effort managed through the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Northeast Regional Office (NERO) in the Atlantic surf clam and ocean quahog fishery ITQ fishery. The ITQ fishery data collection effort has recently been reviewed under the PRA to renew their OMB approval. During this review, it was estimated that the public reporting for this collection would average 5 minutes per response.

Accordingly, using an estimated average burden of 5 minutes per response, a total of 46.15 hours (556 responses x 0.083 hrs/response) is estimated to be the burden for participants in this new data collection. The estimated annual cost to respondents for the hour burden this collection assumes a respondent wage and overhead value of \$15/hour. Using this figure, the annualized cost to respondents would be approximately \$692.25.

c) Expanded Observer Coverage

Amendment 10 establishes a one percent set aside to provide some funding to increase Sea Sampling Observer program sampling frequency on vessels targeting sea scallops. Unlike the existing controlled access set aside, Amendment 10 expands this program to the entire fishery, applied to both controlled access areas and regular open fishing areas. As a result, this management measure will increase the number of observed trips. In order to facilitate the random observer selection process a vessel must provide NMFS with notice at least five working days prior to the date it intends to depart into a specific area via VMS e-mail messaging system or a personal computer equipped with e-mail messaging. If there is no access to Georges Bank groundfish areas, the number of open area trips is estimated to be 1965, which equals to the average number of trips per year estimated for the period 2004- 2006 (Table 5). If access to these areas is provided, however, via Framework 16, the number of open area trips is estimated to be 957 on average during 2004-2006. The average estimated burden was assumed to be 2 minutes per notice, amounting to a total of 31.96 hours and \$ 479.46 in reporting burden to respondents with access and 65.63 hours and \$984.45 without access to Georges Bank groundfish areas.

d) Cooperative Industry Surveys

The actual number of vessels that will apply to enroll in the ad hoc cooperative survey is not known at this time. It will be assumed, however, that all full-time scallop vessels, assumed to be 278, will apply to be a part of this program. The applying vessels will need to meet a minimum qualification standard to enroll in the program. For this reason, the respondents will need to submit an application form which supply information on vessel specifications, including size, horsepower, and number of berths, on vessel and captain availability, vessel owner/captain experience, and estimated cost per DAS for vessel use. Accordingly, using an estimated average burden of 5 minutes per response, a total of 23.17 hours (278 responses x 0.083 hrs/response) is estimated to be the burden for participants in this new data collection. The estimated annual cost to respondents for the hour burden this collection assumes a respondent wage and overhead value of \$15/hour. Using this figure, the annualized cost to respondents would be approximately \$347.5.

Total burden in hours to public under item 12:

Total burden in hours to the public from all these programs, including broken trip adjustment (256.57), DAS exchange (46.15), open area observer coverage (31.96), and cooperative industry surveys (23.173), total to 357.85 with access to Georges Bank groundfish areas. Total burden in hours to the public from all these programs without access to the Groundfish closed areas, including broken trip adjustment (100.28), DAS exchange (46.15), open area observer coverage (65.63), and cooperative industry surveys (31.96), total to 235.23. (see Table 7). The total burden in hours to the public reported on the accompanying submission form (83I form) is based on the larger burden in hours associated with the scenario that allows access to the Georges Bank groundfish closed areas.

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to the respondents or record-keepers resulting from the collection (excluding the value of the burden hours in #12 above).

a) Broken trip adjustment

If there is access to the Georges Bank groundfish areas, 481 applications are anticipated per year for the broken trip adjustment, and a total of 481 stamps would need to be purchased by participants, resulting in an additional cost of \$177.97 (481 stamps x \$0.37/stamp). If there were no access, however, the number of stamps would be 188 at a cost of \$69.56. Participants may wish to retain a copy of the application for their own records. Using an estimate of \$0.10 per page for copying costs, participants would also incur an additional \$48.10 ($\0.10×481 1-page copies) if there is access, and \$18.80 if there is no access, in copying services related to the DAS exchange program. The cost of trip termination notification is assumed to be 79 cents fixed rate per VMS e-mail, which totals to \$379.99 ($481 \times \$0.79/\text{message}$) if there is access, and \$148.52 ($188 \times \$0.79/\text{message}$) if there is no access. In total, the costs to individuals applying for the broken trip adjustment for record-keeping and application purposes total \$606.06 if there is access ($\$177.97 + \$48.10 + \$379.99$) and \$236.88 if there is no access to Georges Bank groundfish areas ($\$69.56 + \$18.80 + \$148.52$).

b) DAS exchange program

With 556 applications anticipated per year for the DAS exchange program, a total of 556 stamps would need to be purchased by participants, resulting in an additional cost of \$205.72 ($556 \text{ stamps} \times \$0.37/\text{stamp}$). Participants may wish to retain a copy of the DAS exchange application for their own records. Using an estimate of \$0.10 per page for copying costs, participants would also incur an additional \$55.60 ($\0.10×556 1-page copies) for copying services related to the DAS leasing program. In total, the costs to individuals participating in the DAS leasing program for record-keeping and application purposes total \$261.32 ($\$205.72 + \55.60).

c) Expanded Observer Coverage

The cost of enrollment via VMS is assumed to be 79 cents fixed rate per VMS e-mail, which totals to \$756.03 ($957 \times \$0.79/\text{message}$) with access and \$1,552.35 ($1,965 \times \0.79) without access to Georges Bank groundfish areas.

d) Cooperative Industry Surveys

With 278 applications anticipated per year to enroll in the cooperative research program, a total of 556 stamps would need to be purchased by participants, resulting in an additional cost of \$102.86 (278 stamps x \$0.37/stamp). Participants may wish to retain a copy of the DAS exchange application for their own records. Using an estimate of \$0.10 per page for copying costs, participants would also incur an additional \$27.80 (\$0.10 x 278 1-page copies) for copying services. In total, the costs to individuals enrolling in the cooperative research program for record-keeping and application purposes total \$130.66 (\$102.86 + \$27.80).

Total costs to the public under item 13:

Total costs to the public other than cost of burden hours from all these programs, including broken trip adjustment (\$606.06), DAS exchange (\$261.32), open area observer coverage (\$756.03) and cooperative industry surveys (\$130.66) total to \$1,754.07 with access. Total costs to the public other than cost of burden hours from all these programs, including broken trip adjustment (\$236.88), DAS exchange (\$261.32), open area observer coverage (\$1,552.35) and cooperative industry surveys (\$130.66) total to \$2,181.21 without access as shown in Table 7. The total cost to the public reported on the accompanying submission form (83I form) is based on the larger cost associated with the scenario that does not allow access to the Georges Bank groundfish closed areas

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government.

Annualized costs to the Federal government for the programs proposed by Amendment 10 and discussed below include staff costs and system operation associated with processing the information. The itemized costs are shown in Table 6 and total costs are also summarized in Table 7. It is assumed that the government will incur no new collection and information processing costs from open area DAS set-aside.

a) Broken trip adjustment

The cost to the government for the to process, investigate, prepare response and adjust DAS for the broken trips is expected to require 3 hours per application. Costs associated with the program reflect a cost of \$25/hour to the government. This results in an estimated annualized cost to the government of \$36,075 (481 applications x 3 hours/response x \$25/hour) if there is access and \$14,100 (188*3*25) if there is no access to Georges Bank groundfish areas, to complete the adjustment. Additional costs likely to be incurred by the government include the costs of distributing DAS adjustment letters to participants. It is estimated that one toner cartridge will be necessary to print these at approximately \$40. These letters would be mailed to participants resulting in postage costs of \$177.97 (481 x \$0.37/stamp) if there is access to Georges Bank groundfish areas and of \$69.56 (188 x \$0.37/stamp) if there is no access. This results in an additional cost of \$217.17 to the government for the management of the DAS exchange program if there is access and an additional \$109.56 if there is no access. In total, the costs to the

government from broken trip adjustment program would be approximately \$36,292.97 (\$36,075.00 +\$214.59) with access and \$14,209.65 with no access to Georges Bank groundfish areas.

b) DAS exchange program

The proposed DAS exchange program would add new burdens for information collection. Costs associated with the program reflect a cost of \$25/hour to the government. The cost to the government for the DAS exchange program is expected to require 10 minutes per request (where a request for review purposes constitutes forms submitted by each vessel involved in the exchange). This results in an estimated annualized cost to the government of \$1,158.33 (278 applications x 0.167 hours/response x \$25/hour) to review DAS exchange requests. Additional costs likely to be incurred by the government include the costs of distributing receipts of the DAS lease to both participants. It is estimated that one toner cartridge will be necessary to print these receipts at approximately \$40. These receipts would be mailed to participants resulting in postage costs of \$205.72 (556 x \$0.37/stamp). This results in an additional cost of \$245.72 to the government for the management of the DAS exchange program. In total, the costs to the government from the DAS leasing program would be approximately \$1,404.05 (1,158.33 +\$245.72).

c) Expanded Observer Coverage

It is assumed that the government will incur no new collection and information processing costs from expanded observer coverage.

d) Cooperative industry surveys

Among the applicants a number of vessels will be selected each year to participate in the cooperative industry survey program. The government will review and inform the applicants whether they are selected to participate in the program or what upgrades they will need to do in order to be included in the future surveys. The processing time will be about 15 minutes if the applicant is approved and 30 minutes if not approved, averaging to 17.5 minutes per applicant. Again, it is assumed that 278 vessel owners will apply for participation in the cooperative industry surveys. As a result, total burden will be 80.62 hours and will cost \$2,015.50 (278 x 0.29 hr x \$25/hr) in wages and salaries (Table 6). The government will mail notifications to the respondents, and will incur \$102.86 in postage costs (278 x \$0.37/stamp). It is estimated that one toner cartridge will be necessary to print the notifications at approximately \$40. Total costs to government from this collection requirement will \$2,158.36 (\$2,015.50+\$102.86+\$40.00).

Total costs to the government:

Total cost to government from administering these programs will amount to \$36,292.97 for broken trips, 1,404.05 for DAS exchanges, and \$2,158.36 for cooperative research enrollments, totaling \$39,855.38 if there is access to the groundfish closed areas. Total cost to government from administering these programs will amount to \$14,209.56 for broken trips, 1,404.05 for DAS exchanges, and \$2,158.36 for cooperative research enrollments, totaling \$17,771.97 if there is no access to the groundfish closed areas. (Table 7).

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB 83-I.

The new collection requirements, including broken trip adjustment, DAS exchange, open area observer coverage, and cooperative industry surveys provide significant management information and enforcement tools for the implementation of Amendment 10 proposed rules. The information will help to verify fishing locations and will help in monitoring of effort both in controlled access and open areas. Accurate monitoring of the area TACs, and improved management will benefit the scallop industry. New collection requirements will also facilitate monitoring of the fishery by enforcement agents, which is essential for the success of the area rotation management for scallops.

16. For collections whose results will be published, outline the plans for tabulation and publication.

Results from this collection may be used in scientific, management, technical or general informational publications such as Fisheries of the United States, which follows prescribed statistical tabulations and summary table formats. Data are available to the general public on request in summary form only. Data are available to NMFS employees in detailed form on a need-to-know basis only.

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons why display would be inappropriate.

There are no reasons why display would be inappropriate.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19 of the OMB 83-I.

There are no exceptions.

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

No statistical methods are employed in the information collection procedures; the requirements are mandatory for participants in the Atlantic sea scallop fishery.

TABLES

Table 1. Limited access and general category permits in the sea scallop fishery.

Permit category	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Full-time	227	227	214	203	202	207	219	223	229	230
Full-time small dredge	5	4	5	3	2	1	3	13	25	32
Full-time trawl	30	32	27	23	23	16	17	16	16	16
Total full-time	262	263	246	229	227	224	239	252	270	278
Part-time	26	21	18	16	11	11	15	14	13	9
Part-time small dredge	8	6	8	8	6	3	4	6	8	16
Part-time trawl	30	28	27	30	26	18	20	18	10	8
Total part-time	64	55	53	54	43	32	39	38	31	33
Occasional	4	3	2	2	3	4	4	5	4	2
Occasional trawl	28	26	25	20	19	20	16	15	15	8
Total occasional	32	29	27	22	22	24	20	20	19	10
Total limited access	358	347	326	305	292	280	298	310	320	321
General category	1,960	2,067	1,984	1,993	1,930	2,074	2,247	2,293	2,493	2,257

Table 2. Limited access vessel by permit category and principal port (2002 fishing year)

Region of Principal Port	Data	Permit Category			
		Full-time	Part-time	Occasional	Grand Total
Mid-Atlantic	Number of vessels	133	22	3	158
	Average GRT	140	118	114	136
	Average Length	78	75	74	78
New England	Number of vessels	123	6	0	129
	Average GRT	159	95	116	156
	Average Length	83	65	65	82
	All vessels	256	28	3	287

Table 3. Controlled access trips in Hudson Canyon and Virginia Beach areas by pounds

DATA	2001		2002		2003		2001 - 2003	
	Number of trips	% of trips	Number of trips	% of trips	Number of trips	% of trips	Number of trips (3 year totals)	% of trips (annual average for 3 years)
DAS -VMS	637	NA	277	NA	231	NA	373	NA
Catch-VMS								
<12000 lb.	190	31.83%	17	19.77%	11	10.78%	218	27.77%
All trips	597	100.00%	86	100.00%	102	100.00%	785	100.00%

Table 4. Initial allocations of controlled access area trips

Access/ Area	Number of Permits (2003)	2004		2005		2006 (default)		Average number of trips (2004-2006) (A)	Average number of broken trips (col.A*27.7 7%)
		Number of trips per vessel	Total number of trips	Number of trips per vessel	Total number of trips	Number of trips per vessel	Total number of trips		
1. No access to the GB Groundfish areas Hudson Canyon area									
Full-time	278	4	1112	3	834	0	0	649	180
Part-time	33	1	33	1	33	0	0	22	6
Occasional	10	1	10	1	10	0	0	7	2
Total	321		1155		877		0	677	188
2. Access to the Georges Bank ground fish areas (implemented via Framework 16) All controlled access areas combined									
Full-time	278	7	1946	7	1946	4	1112	1668	463
Part-time	33	2	66	2	66	1	33	55	15
Occasional	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	10	3
Total	321		2022		2022		1155	1733	481

Table 5. Estimated open area trips by fishing year and with or without access to the Georges Bank groundfish areas

Fishing year	Total estimated DAS with no Access	Estimated number of trips with no access*	Total estimated DAS with Access	Estimated number of trips with access*
2001	16,616	1,187	11,307	808
2002	29,448	2,103	10,800	771
2003	36,466	2,605	18,100	1,293
Average (2001-03)	27,510	1,965	13,402	957

* Number of trips is estimated by dividing total DAS with 14, which is the average estimated scallop trip duration.

Table 6. Itemized burden estimates for the government

Requirement	Number of entities	Items per entity	Total number of Items	Burden Hours	Wages and salaries ⁽¹⁾	Additional costs ⁽²⁾	Mailing costs	Total costs
a. Broken trip adjustment application								
1. Without access	321	0.58 ⁽³⁾	188	564.00	\$14,100.00	\$40.00	\$69.56	\$14,209.56
2. With access	321	1.49 ⁽⁴⁾	481	1,443.00	\$36,075.00	\$40.00	\$177.97	\$36,292.97
b. One to one DAS exchange program	278	1	278	46.33	\$1,158.33	\$40.00	\$205.72	\$1,404.05
c. Open area DAS set-aside								
1. VMS / 5 Day Notification: Without Access	321	2.98	957	-	-	-	-	-
2. VMS / 5 Day Notification: With Access	321	6.12	1965	-	-	-	-	-
d. Cooperative survey enrollment and processing	278	1	278	80.62	\$2,015.50	\$40.00	\$102.86	\$2,158.36
e. Total Costs: Without access to the Georges Bank Groundfish areas				690.95	\$17,273.83	\$120.00	\$378.14	\$17,771.97
f. Total Costs: With access to the Georges Bank Groundfish areas				1,569.95	\$39,248.83	\$120.00	\$486.55	\$39,855.38

(1). Assumed to be \$25 per hour

(2). Cost of printing, toner.

(3). Total number of items (188) divided by number of entities (321).

(4). Total number of items (481) divided by number of entities (321).

Table 7. Burden and cost estimates for the public and summarized costs for the government

Requirement	Number of Entities	Items per Entity	Total Number of Items	Response Time	Total Burden in hours	Cost of Time to Public ⁽¹⁾	Other Costs to Public ⁽²⁾	Total Costs to Government ⁽⁵⁾
a. Broken trip adjustment								
1. Without access								
Trip termination notice via VMS	321	0.58 ⁽³⁾	188	0.0334	6.28	\$94.19	\$148.52	-
Application for broken trip adjustment	321	0.58 ⁽³⁾	188	0.5	94.00	\$1,410.00	\$88.36	\$14,209.56
Total			376		100.28	\$1,504.19	\$236.88	\$14,209.56
2. With access								
Trip termination notice via VMS	321	1.49 ⁽⁴⁾	481	0.0334	16.07	\$240.98	\$379.99	-
Application for broken trip adjustment	321	1.49 ⁽⁴⁾	481	0.5	240.50	\$3,607.50	\$226.07	\$36,292.97
Total			962		256.57	\$3,848.48	\$606.06	\$36,292.97
b. One to one DAS exchange program	278	2	556	0.0833	46.15	\$692.25	\$261.32	\$1,404.05
c. Open area DAS set-aside								-
1. VMS / 5 Day Notification: Without Access	321	6.12	1965	0.0334	65.63	\$984.45	\$1,552.35	-
2. VMS / 5 Day Notification: With Access	321	2.98	957	0.0334	31.96	\$479.46	\$756.03	-
d. Cooperative survey enrollment	278	1	278	0.0833	23.173	\$347.50	\$130.66	\$1,404.05
e. Total costs without access			3,175 (6)		235.23	\$3,528.39	\$2,181.21	\$17,886.42
f. Total costs with access			2,753		357.85 (6)	\$5,367.69	\$1,754.07	\$39,969.83

(1). Assumed to be \$15 per hour.

(2). Daily and other reporting on VMS is \$0.79 fixed rate per VMS e-mail message (BoatracS) .

(3). Total number of items (188) divided by number of entities (321).

(4). Total number of items (481) divided by number of entities (321).

(5). See Table 6.

(6). Figures reported on accompanying Form 83I.



Broken Trip Adjustment Sheet

SUBMIT TO
US DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, NOAA
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
ONE BLACKBURN DRIVE, GLOUCESTER, MA 01930

Information:

Owner Name/Corporation: _____

Vessel Name: _____

Permit #: _____

Official #: _____

Vessel Captain: _____

Date and Time of Incident: _____

Date of VMS Notification: _____

Pounds Landed: _____

Access Area Fished: _____

Nature of Incident: _____

Departure Date: _____

Landing Date: _____

Designation of Areas: Hudson Canyon Area	HC
Nantucket Light Ship	NLS
Georges Bank Closed Area 1	GB1
Georges Bank Closed Area 2	GB2

This form is required under 50 CFR § 648.____ to monitor the days-at-sea allocation and usage for limited access scallop permit holders. Signature of this form certifies that permit holder requirements specified in 50 CFR § 648.____, and that the information provided on this form is true, complete and correct to the best of their knowledge, and made in good faith (18 U.S.C. 1001). Making a false statement on this form is punishable by law.

Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 5 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining data needed, and completing and reviewing the information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or suggestions for reducing this burden to NMFS, One Blackburn Drive, Gloucester MA 01930; and to OMB, Paperwork Reduction Project, Washington, DC 20509.

OMB Approval No. ____-____
Expires ____/____/____



Cooperative Industry Survey

SUBMIT TO
US DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, NOAA
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
ONE BLACKBURN DRIVE, GLOUCESTER, MA 01930

General Information:

Owner Name/Corporation: _____

Vessel Name: _____

Permit #: _____

Official #: _____

Vessel Captain/Year Experience: _____

Vessel Specifications:

Length of Vessel/Gross Tonnage/Net Tonnage _____

Horse Power: _____

Number of Berths: _____

Estimated Cost Per DAS for Vessel Use: _____

This form is required under 50 CFR § 648.____ to monitor the days-at-sea allocation and usage for limited access scallop permit holders. Signature of this form certifies that permit holder requirements specified in 50 CFR § 648.____, and that the information provided on this form is true, complete and correct to the best of their knowledge, and made in good faith (18 U.S.C. 1001). Making a false statement on this form is punishable by law.

Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 5 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining data needed, and completing and reviewing the information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or suggestions for reducing this burden to NMFS, One Blackburn Drive, Gloucester MA 01930; and to OMB, Paperwork Reduction Project, Washington, DC 20509.

OMB Approval No. ____-____
Expires __/__/____



REQUEST FOR SEA SCALLOP ACCESS AREA TRIP EXCHANGE

SUBMIT TO
SEA SCALLOP DAYS-AT-SEA TRANSFERS
US DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, NOAA
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
ONE BLACKBURN DRIVE, GLOUCESTER, MA 01930

Vessel A Information:

Owner Name: _____ Permit #: _____
Vessel Name: _____ Official #: _____
Permit Category: _____ Area Traded: _____

Vessel B Information:

Owner Name: _____ Permit #: _____
Vessel Name: _____ Official #: _____
Permit Category: _____ Area Traded: _____

Sea Scallop Access Area Trip Exchange: Exchanges of trips in Sea Scallop Access Areas is on a one-to one basis. Please provide the areas to be exchanged in the space provided for area traded

Signed: _____ Signed: _____
(Vessel A) (Vessel B)
Dated: _____ Dated: _____

DAS exchanges are valid through the end of the current fishing year and may be used in accordance with the regulations found at 50 CFR § XXX>XX.

This form is required under 50 CFR § 648.____ to monitor the days-at-sea allocation and usage for limited access scallop permit holders. Signature of this form certifies that permit holder requirements specified in 50 CFR § 648.____, and that the information provided on this form is true, complete and correct to the best of their knowledge, and made in good faith (18 U.S.C. 1001). Making a false statement on this form is punishable by law.

Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no person is required to respond to, nor shall any person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act, unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB Control Number.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 5 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining data needed, and completing and reviewing the information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or suggestions for reducing this burden to NMFS, One Blackburn Drive, Gloucester MA 01930; and to OMB, Paperwork Reduction Project, Washington, DC 20509.

OMB Approval No. ____-____
Expires ____/____/____